



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,901	12/30/2003	Joseph Deluise	LRU-103	6789
27014	7590	07/18/2006	EXAMINER	
JOHN R. BENEFIEL 280 DAINES ST. #100 B BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			DONNELLY, JEROME W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3764	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/747,901

Applicant(s)

DELUISE ET AL.

Examiner

Jerome W. Donnelly

Art Unit

3764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on petition dated 3/15/06 revival of abn
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



JEROME DONNELLY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond in view of Fischer et al.

Richmond discloses a device comprising: an upper body member comprising: a base member and a plurality of rollers; and

A lower body member comprising a base, and rollers.

Richmond however does not disclose his device comprising handles and a cushion, on a top side of the base.

Fisher et al discloses a device having handles as claimed and what seems to be cushioning on the device.

Given the above teachings the examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide U-shaped handles on the upper body member of Richmond, for the purpose of providing a user means upon which to grasp and cushioning, to aide in the comfort of the user.

In regard to claims 7 and 8 the examiner draws the applicants attention to fig. 1A of Richmond wherein the user positions themselves on all fours and stretches outwardly. Although

Art Unit: 3764

the user is not shown wherein they place their forearms on the upper rollable member the examiner notes that it would have been obvious to do so given that the user is still using their upper limbs as portions of the body upon which the user rest when stretching and extending their body when exercising.

Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond in view of Fisher and further in view of Chuang.

To manufacture rollers on platforms which do not swivel is obvious in view of the rollers of Chuang, so as to keep the platform from turning.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond in view of Fisher and further in view of Woelfer.

The examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a bumper on a side of the base member of Richmond modified supra in view of the bumper (7) of Woelfer Jr. so as to protect the device when in use.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond in view of Fisher and Pool.

The examiner notes that to manufacture roller members wherein they include a rigid base plate, means for attaching and a frame is obvious and known in the art of rolling device and/or devices which are rolled on by the user.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Art Unit: 3764


Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerome Donnelly at telephone number (571) 272-4975.

Jerome Donnelly

JEROME DONNELLY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JD', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.